The Chicago Tribune.

VOL. 24. CHICAGO, MONDAY, MARCH 6, 1871. NO. 214.

WASHINGTON.

Defeat of the Ocean Telegraph Bill for Want of the President's Signature.

Fight for the Position of Delegate from the District of Columbia.

The Coal Duty Repeal Bill.

Strong Effort to be Made to Get the Measure Through the Senate.

An Early Adjournment of Congress Looked for.

Special Dispatch to The Chicago Tribune.

SENATOR LOGAN SERENADED.

WASHINGTON, March 5.—Gustavus Logan, who has served out by the members of the Lincoln Republican Association, because of his having been a secessionist, swore in as Senator. J. Mc-Donald, on behalf of the association, made a congratulatory address, to which Logan responded in a few brief remarks, assuring his admirers that he would endeavor to live up to the principles which they had espoused, and to the confidence which they had reposed in him. He was then escorted to the Senate Chamber by the committee, who were joined by a number of Louisiana Senators, and were serving their annual apprenticeship as page boys, and took their seats in the Senate. Logan is a native of Louisiana, and is about 30 years of age.

SENATE CAUCUS.

The Senate will hold a caucus to-morrow night to consider the question of expediting the business of the session. The House resolution providing for an adjournment next Wednesday, it is said, will be agreed upon to take place some time next week. Almost the only reason given by Senators for wishing to delay adjournment is the necessity of some legislation for the protection of loyal men in the South, but the Ku-Klux Committee on Outrages is to report to the Senate during the session will be ready for action. The Senate will not be troubled with the presence of a large number of members of the House in the city, and who were honored out of service as above stated.

PERSONAL MENTION.

Strong effort will be made this week to pass the bill abolishing the duty on coal, which failed to pass by a vote of two votes, after having been in the library by a large majority

The Chicago Tribune.

Terms of Subscription (invariable in advance):

TERMS BY MAIL.

Daily Edition, Single Copy, one year $15.00
Daily Edition, Single Copy, one month 1.50
Tri-Weekly Edition, Single Copy, one year ... 6.00
Tri-Weekly Edition, Five Copies, one year ... 25.00
Weekly Edition, Single Copy, one year 3.00
Weekly Edition, Ten Copies, one year 12.00

To remit by Draft, Express, Post Office order, or in registered letters, at our risk.

Specimen copies sent free. Subscriptions may commence at any time, and give Post Office address in full. Remittances should be made payable to the order of the Company.

Remit by Draft, express, Post Office order, or in registered letters, at our risk.

TERMS BY CARRIER.

Daily, delivered, Sunday excepted, 50 cents per week.
Daily, delivered, Sunday included, 60 cents per week.

Address TRIBUNE COMPANY,
CHICAGO, ILL.

MONDAY, MARCH 6, 1871.

THE FORTY-SECOND CONGRESS.

The unanimity with which Mr. Blaine was nominated by the Republican caucus for re-election as Speaker of the House of Representatives, is a strong evidence of his acceptability as a presiding officer, and of the confidence which is felt by all in the fairness with which he performs his official duty. It is well known that there is a wide difference of opinion among Republican members of the House on the subject of revenue legislation, and the fact that the formation of committees will have a decided influence upon that legislation is thoroughly understood by the members and by the country generally. Under these circumstances, the unanimous nomination of Mr. Blaine is a strong proof that the Republicans have faith in the fairness and justice with which he will perform his duty. The next Congress will be the first for six years in which all the States will be represented. During the later years of the war, and until the present session, the proportion of the members of the opposition to the whole number of the members has been very small. In the new arrangement of committees it is likely that the Democratic party will have a larger representation on such committees than heretofore. The two-thirds or three-fourths majority of the Republicans no longer exists, and the committees will, therefore, be so composed as to permit the minority to be represented in proportion to their numbers. The presence of a full House will also admit of the selection of committees without the necessity or doubling up, or the appointment of the same members on several committees.

We suppose there is a very decided majority of the House in favor of revenue reform, that is, in favor of a reduction of the tariff generally, if not in favor of a repeal of all merely protective duties. No less than ninety-seven Republican members of the last House voted to repeal the duty on coal, and the number of the present House who will repeat that vote is much larger. It is likely that, in the reorganization of committees, the sense of the House will be reflected; certainly, the committees will not be so constituted as to defeat the will of the large majority.

In the Senate there has been a decided change, so far as the question of revenue laws is concerned, and we think it will be found that even in that body, as now constituted, the protectionists will not have that overwhelming ascendancy they have hitherto had and which they still claim in that body.

THE CITY SEWERS.

The Committee on Municipal Corporations in the House of Representatives, on Saturday, announced that part of the general act relating to cities of the larger class which provides for sewers, by striking out what is known as the "Talcy" bill, and inserting a provision from the "Mayors'" bill. What has been inserted is as follows:

SECTION 1. That whenever it shall become necessary, in the opinion of the City Council, to provide a general system of sewerage and drainage for the City, the City Council shall have power so to do, and for that purpose may cause the whole or any part of the city to be laid off into districts, to be drained by principal sewers, and may provide by ordinance for the general plan or drainage by sewers or drains for the whole city, and for the plan and record the same.

SEC. 2. That the City Council shall have power to levy and collect a special tax for the construction of the sewers, or any part thereof, in any district, and to issue certificates of indebtedness for such special assessment against the property in such district, payable in not more than ten annual instalments, with interest at a rate not exceeding seven per cent per annum, and to provide for the collection of the same by ordinance prescribed, but the notice of the time and place of making the assessment and of the application for a confirmation thereof, shall be given as in the case of assessments for other local improvements by special assessment.

SEC. 3. That the City Council shall have power to change and alter such districts from time to time, by a vote of two-thirds of the members elected.

SEC. 4. Where the city shall not be divided into districts by the said City Council, as above provided, relating to the same, the city shall constitute one district, and the city shall, in constructing sewers and drains, and levying and collecting assessments therefor, be governed as provided in Chapter 4 of this act.

This does not meet the difficulty which at present exists in Chicago; on the contrary, it increases it. What this city needs is some provision by which the present debt, and the interest thereon incurred for building the 145 miles of sewers already constructed, shall be paid. These sewers have been built at a cost of $3,000,000. Of that sum $500,000 have been paid; the remainder, bearing an annual interest of about $180,000, is a charge upon the real property of the city, and the whole city has a general interest in the payment of the debt. There is no serious objection to special assessments for sewers, because that process is a saving of 50 per cent in their cost; but there is a general protest against the injustice of taxing one class of the taxable property of the whole city to pay $3,000,000 of original cost and $3,000,000 of interest for constructing 145 miles of sewers, and then compelling a portion of the real estate of the city to pay for those to be hereafter constructed. Every sewer built is, ipso facto, a benefit to the city, but it has a special benefit to the property it drains. No person builds a house in this city, no matter how remote may be its location, who does not do so expecting to have it improved, benefited, and rendered habitable by direct connection with the sewers, water, and gas. All unimproved property in this city, in front of which the gas, and water pipes, and sewers are constructed, have an additional cash value, and are more salable than if not so improved, and this additional cash value is a benefit, and greater than the cost of laying the pipes or constructing the sewers. Sewers are an essential, particularly in this city. They cannot be dispensed with; and everybody is willing to pay for them. But where a lot has paid its share for this convenience, it ought not to be taxed therefor forever. When a lot has contributed the city its cost for its sewerage, it ought to be relieved from any further tax. Thus, whether the sewerage be carried on generally or by districts, the special assessment plan is the most economical. Under the district system, the plan would work pretty fairly. Take the Fifteenth Ward as a district. Under this rule, the property in that ward would be taxed to raise, say, $75,000 or $100,000 a year, to be expended exclusively in that ward for sewers; and, when the work was completed, the property of the ward would be forever released from the tax for that purpose. Under the general tax system, $600,000 will be raised annually for sewers, of which the Fifteenth Ward will have $25,000, to be expended within its limits for sewerage, and will pay $15,000 of the tax. In this way that ward will be sewered some time near the year 1900, and, in consideration of that fact, the property of that ward for the preceding fifty years will be taxed to pay for building sewers in the twenty additional square miles of territory which will be added to the city in that time. Under the Talcy bill, any ward or section of the city, upon the payment of $1.40 per front foot, can have all the sewers it may want, and be forever after discharged from sewer tax. Whether the district system or the Talcy plan be adopted, is of very little moment, provided there be an adjustment of the present difficulty.

On the city system the property now drained by sewers the cost of constructing them, or reimburse the City Treasury the amount set aside for that purpose? If this can be done then a provision to that effect, making it by our charter, would remove from the mind of every man in this city a load of anxiety. That would make the city to-day worth more than all the property now assessed for sewers, and the property now sewered would be relieved from all further taxation for that purpose. The Cook County delegation at Springfield have this question before them, and ought to be able to adopt some satisfactory arrangement. We do not think there are two sides to the question as to the justice, policy, and advisability of the system of assessing all property for the payment of the expenses of the sewers, and not charging a part of the expense to the general expense and the other part at the cost of the property sewered. This ought to be remedied in some form.

MIXING GRAINS.

It is, we think, to be regretted that the Board of Trade did not, on Friday last, proceed to examine into the character of the mixed grades which, for a day or two, they seemed to be founding, instead of deciding virtually, that there was no mud-puddle to examine. Upon the merits of the particular case then under consideration we do not care now to enter, accepting it as res adjudicata, so far as it affects individual reputations; but we nevertheless believe that an opportunity was offered to the board to justify itself before the business community of the whole country in the matter of grain inspection, if such justification is possible; and if not, then to set right whatever may be wrong in the method of grain inspection. That subject calls for some further comment.

It is not a mooted question in morality that adulteration is wrong; that the grocer who sands his sugar, or waters his whiskey, or puts chicory in his coffee, or peach-leaves in his tea, is a cheat. If he is a wholesale grocer, it is not considered a valid defense that he does not deceive the retail grocer who buys of him, because the latter understands that the sugar or the coffee, the whiskey or the sugar, have been so treated, and purchases with that understanding. The articles go finally into the hands of the consumer, who does not buy with any such understanding, or, at least, with any knowledge of what he is either cheated unknowingly into paying for something which he does not wish to buy, or, if he knows that he is cheated, accepts the fact because he cannot help himself. But does so with indignant protest. No matter how many there are who are consenting to the fraud, a fraud there is from which somebody suffers, and that sufferer is generally the consumer. If it were not so there would be no fraud, for frauds are not committed without a motive. There is not, we presume, a single member of the Board of Trade who would not instantly change his grocer if he believed he was in the habit of putting upon him tea, or coffee, or sugar, which was partly those articles and partly something else. Nor would he accept it, even as a palliation of the wrong done him and his family, if it were replied to his remonstrance that this system of fraudulent adulteration was "the custom of the trade;" but would probably reply that "the trade, then, might drink the stuff and be *dashed* to it!"

Now we do not see, and we believe the public does not see, why this principle is not just as applicable to the mixing of grains as to the adulteration of groceries. It is understood that such mixtures are common among our grain dealers, and that it is done in two ways; good grain and that of an inferior quality are mixed together, and passed as good, as in the case of No. 2 wheat and lower grades; or one kind of grain is mixed with another kind to give it weight, and passed as the first kind, as in the case of corn and barley. The certificates of inspection of grain state in one case either that the grain is all of the quality of the best of the mixture; or, if they recognize the fact of mixture as all, where two grains are mixed, they certify only to the quantity and quality of one kind, the best, and indicate the presence of the other kind also on the same vessel, without stating where or of what kind, by the words "mixed cargo." Take two instances by way of illustration: A grain dealer has a quantity of No. 2 spring wheat which he goes to sell or ship for a market. It is of the best quality and worth the highest price. He has also another quantity of another, and perhaps much lower grade, and, of course, worth only a lower price. A certain portion of the latter is mixed with the No. 2, but so carefully mixed as to avoid detection, while it deteriorates the quality. Has not, he asks, a man a right to do as he pleases with his own property? Unquestionably, if he does not work to injury to anybody else. The purchaser, he adds, understands that such mixture has been made, and he, therefore, is guiltless of fraud. But that is not the end of the transaction. The purchaser buys it well aware, as he is, that it is to be sold at last to the miller, and the flour-dealer, and the baker, or the domestic consumer, who buy and use, at the highest price, an adulterated article, which is not worth the price they pay for it. The fraud is, in effect, practiced upon the consumer, and that fraud is made possible by the mixture made for that fraudulent purpose. That it is the custom of the trade is no defense of it. Trade is not to be conducted by trader rules with No. 2 oats an inferior quality, or mixes a quantity of barley with an inferior quality of oats, to give it weight and make it pass as No. 2. Here the fraud is precisely the same on the final consumer who buys the adulterated article as No. 2 oats. Nor does the fraud stop here. The producer, as well as the consumer, is a sufferer. The reputation which, in the course of trade, has become attached to No. 2 wheat and No. 2 oats in the Eastern markets is such that these grades uniformly rule less than similar grades of Milwaukee grains, and the dealer who offers these grades, which are honestly what they purport to be, must either sell at a lower price than his rightful due, or commit a further fraud by rating the grain at a higher grade than belongs to it. Out of all this has grown up a system of fraudulent certificates, of trickery and deception, the exposure of which has undoubtedly been of serious injury to the trade of Chicago, and which has resulted in doubling the end which it was hoped to gain by it. We presume these statements to not be questioned, and we submit whether, if it be true that honesty is the best policy, it is not worth while for the Board of Trade to look the thing squarely in the face, as it undoubtedly has done in the case in Iowa it, that its "was in earnest about it previously, and to establish for any injury committed by either, would seem have to be careful, and, to avoid punishment for crime, would provide himself with competent and properly-educated compounders of medicine. A druggist may very properly receive the highest confidence of his customers, and be appointed to fulfilling only four of the years at the general expense and the other part at the cost of the property saved. This work to be remedied in some form.

THE DRUGGISTS' CASE.

It is, we think, to be regretted that the Board of Trade did not, on Friday last, proceed to examine into the character of the mixed grades which, for a day or two, they seemed to be founding, instead of deciding virtually, that there was no mud-puddle to examine. Upon the merits of the particular case then under consideration we do not care now to enter, accepting it as res adjudicata, so far as it affects individual reputations; but we nevertheless believe that an opportunity was offered to the board to justify itself before the business community of the whole country in the matter of grain inspection, if such justification is possible; and if not, then to set right whatever may be wrong in the method of grain inspection. That subject calls for some further comment.

It is not a mooted question in morality that adulteration is wrong; that the grocer who sands his sugar, or waters his whiskey, or puts chicory in his coffee, or peach-leaves in his tea, is a cheat. If he is a wholesale grocer, it is not considered a valid defense that he does not deceive the retail grocer who buys of him, because the latter understands that the sugar or the coffee, the whiskey or the sugar, have been so treated, and purchases with that understanding. The articles go finally into the hands of the consumer, who does not buy with any such understanding, or, at least, with any knowledge of what he is either cheated unknowingly into paying for something which he does not wish to buy, or, if he knows that he is cheated, accepts the fact because he cannot help himself. But does so with indignant protest. No matter how many there are who are consenting to the fraud, a fraud there is from which somebody suffers, and that sufferer is generally the consumer. If it were not so there would be no fraud, for frauds are not committed without a motive. There is not, we presume, a single member of the Board of Trade who would not instantly change his grocer if he believed he was in the habit of putting upon him tea, or coffee, or sugar, which was partly those articles and partly something else. Nor would he accept it, even as a palliation of the wrong done him and his family, if it were replied to his remonstrance that this system of fraudulent adulteration was "the custom of the trade;" but would probably reply that "the trade, then, might drink the stuff and be *dashed* to it!"

Now we do not see, and we believe the public does not see, why this principle is not just as applicable to the mixing of grains as to the adulteration of groceries. It is understood that such mixtures are common among our grain dealers, and that it is done in two ways; good grain and that of an inferior quality are mixed together, and passed as good, as in the case of No. 2 wheat and lower grades; or one kind of grain is mixed with another kind to give it weight, and passed as the first kind, as in the case of corn and barley. The certificates of inspection of grain state in one case either that the grain is all of the quality of the best of the mixture; or, if they recognize the fact of mixture as all, where two grains are mixed, they certify only to the quantity and quality of one kind, the best, and indicate the presence of the other kind also on the same vessel, without stating where or of what kind, by the words "mixed cargo." Take two instances by way of illustration: A grain dealer has a quantity of No. 2 spring wheat which he goes to sell or ship for a market. It is of the best quality and worth the highest price. He has also another quantity of another, and perhaps much lower grade, and, of course, worth only a lower price. A certain portion of the latter is mixed with the No. 2, but so carefully mixed as to avoid detection, while it deteriorates the quality. Has not, he asks, a man a right to do as he pleases with his own property? Unquestionably, if he does not work to injury to anybody else. The purchaser, he adds, understands that such mixture has been made, and he, therefore, is guiltless of fraud. But that is not the end of the transaction. The purchaser buys it well aware, as he is, that it is to be sold at last to the miller, and the flour-dealer, and the baker, or the domestic consumer, who buy and use, at the highest price, an adulterated article, which is not worth the price they pay for it. The fraud is, in effect, practiced upon the consumer, and that fraud is made possible by the mixture made for that fraudulent purpose. That it is the custom of the trade is no defense of it. Trade is not to be conducted by trader rules with No. 2 oats an inferior quality, or mixes a quantity of barley with an inferior quality of oats, to give it weight and make it pass as No. 2. Here the fraud is precisely the same on the final consumer who buys the adulterated article as No. 2 oats. Nor does the fraud stop here. The producer, as well as the consumer, is a sufferer. The reputation which, in the course of trade, has become attached to No. 2 wheat and No. 2 oats in the Eastern markets is such that these grades uniformly rule less than similar grades of Milwaukee grains, and the dealer who offers these grades, which are honestly what they purport to be, must either sell at a lower price than his rightful due, or commit a further fraud by rating the grain at a higher grade than belongs to it. Out of all this has grown up a system of fraudulent certificates, of trickery and deception, the exposure of which has undoubtedly been of serious injury to the trade of Chicago, and which has resulted in doubling the end which it was hoped to gain by it. We presume these statements to not be questioned, and we submit whether, if it be true that honesty is the best policy, it is not worth while for the Board of Trade to look the thing squarely in the face, as it undoubtedly has done in the case in Iowa it, that its "was in earnest about it previously, and to establish for any injury committed by either, would seem have to be careful, and, to avoid punishment for crime, would provide himself with competent and properly-educated compounders of medicine. A druggist may very properly receive the highest confidence of his customers, and be appointed to fulfilling only four of the years at the general expense and the other part at the cost of the property saved. This work to be remedied in some form.

MIXING GRAINS.

It is, we think, to be regretted that the Board of Trade did not, on Friday last, proceed to examine into the character of the mixed grades which, for a day or two, they seemed to be founding, instead of deciding virtually, that there was no mud-puddle to examine. Upon the merits of the particular case then under consideration we do not care now to enter, accepting it as res adjudicata, so far as it affects individual reputations; but we nevertheless believe that an opportunity was offered to the board to justify itself before the business community of the whole country in the matter of grain inspection, if such justification is possible; and if not, then to set right whatever may be wrong in the method of grain inspection. That subject calls for some further comment.

It is not a mooted question in morality that adulteration is wrong; that the grocer who sands his sugar, or waters his whiskey, or puts chicory in his coffee, or peach-leaves in his tea, is a cheat. If he is a wholesale grocer, it is not considered a valid defense that he does not deceive the retail grocer who buys of him, because the latter understands that the sugar or the coffee, the whiskey or the sugar, have been so treated, and purchases with that understanding. The articles go finally into the hands of the consumer, who does not buy with any such understanding, or, at least, with any knowledge of what he is either cheated unknowingly into paying for something which he does not wish to buy, or, if he knows that he is cheated, accepts the fact because he cannot help himself. But does so with indignant protest. No matter how many there are who are consenting to the fraud, a fraud there is from which somebody suffers, and that sufferer is generally the consumer. If it were not so there would be no fraud, for frauds are not committed without a motive. There is not, we presume, a single member of the Board of Trade who would not instantly change his grocer if he believed he was in the habit of putting upon him tea, or coffee, or sugar, which was partly those articles and partly something else. Nor would he accept it, even as a palliation of the wrong done him and his family, if it were replied to his remonstrance that this system of fraudulent adulteration was "the custom of the trade;" but would probably reply that "the trade, then, might drink the stuff and be *dashed* to it!"

Now we do not see, and we believe the public does not see, why this principle is not just as applicable to the mixing of grains as to the adulteration of groceries. It is understood that such mixtures are common among our grain dealers, and that it is done in two ways; good grain and that of an inferior quality are mixed together, and passed as good, as in the case of No. 2 wheat and lower grades; or one kind of grain is mixed with another kind to give it weight, and passed as the first kind, as in the case of corn and barley. The certificates of inspection of grain state in one case either that the grain is all of the quality of the best of the mixture; or, if they recognize the fact of mixture as all, where two grains are mixed, they certify only to the quantity and quality of one kind, the best, and indicate the presence of the other kind also on the same vessel, without stating where or of what kind, by the words "mixed cargo." Take two instances by way of illustration: A grain dealer has a quantity of No. 2 spring wheat which he goes to sell or ship for a market. It is of the best quality and worth the highest price. He has also another quantity of another, and perhaps much lower grade, and, of course, worth only a lower price. A certain portion of the latter is mixed with the No. 2, but so carefully mixed as to avoid detection, while it deteriorates the quality. Has not, he asks, a man a right to do as he pleases with his own property? Unquestionably, if he does not work to injury to anybody else. The purchaser, he adds, understands that such mixture has been made, and he, therefore, is guiltless of fraud. But that is not the end of the transaction. The purchaser buys it well aware, as he is, that it is to be sold at last to the miller, and the flour-dealer, and the baker, or the domestic consumer, who buy and use, at the highest price, an adulterated article, which is not worth the price they pay for it. The fraud is, in effect, practiced upon the consumer, and that fraud is made possible by the mixture made for that fraudulent purpose. That it is the custom of the trade is no defense of it. Trade is not to be conducted by trader rules with No. 2 oats an inferior quality, or mixes a quantity of barley with an inferior quality of oats, to give it weight and make it pass as No. 2. Here the fraud is precisely the same on the final consumer who buys the adulterated article as No. 2 oats. Nor does the fraud stop here. The producer, as well as the consumer, is a sufferer. The reputation which, in the course of trade, has become attached to No. 2 wheat and No. 2 oats in the Eastern markets is such that these grades uniformly rule less than similar grades of Milwaukee grains, and the dealer who offers these grades, which are honestly what they purport to be, must either sell at a lower price than his rightful due, or commit a further fraud by rating the grain at a higher grade than belongs to it. Out of all this has grown up a system of fraudulent certificates, of trickery and deception, the exposure of which has undoubtedly been of serious injury to the trade of Chicago, and which has resulted in doubling the end which it was hoped to gain by it. We presume these statements to not be questioned, and we submit whether, if it be true that honesty is the best policy, it is not worth while for the Board of Trade to look the thing squarely in the face, as it undoubtedly has done in the case in Iowa it, that its "was in earnest about it previously, and to establish for any injury committed by either, would seem have to be careful, and, to avoid punishment for crime, would provide himself with competent and properly-educated compounders of medicine. A druggist may very properly receive the highest confidence of his customers, and be appointed to fulfilling only four of the years at the general expense and the other part at the cost of the property saved. This work to be remedied in some form.

MIXING GRAINS.

It is, we think, to be regretted that the Board of Trade did not, on Friday last, proceed to examine into the character of the mixed grades which, for a day or two, they seemed to be founding, instead of deciding virtually, that there was no mud-puddle to examine. Upon the merits of the particular case then under consideration we do not care now to enter, accepting it as res adjudicata, so far as it affects individual reputations; but we nevertheless believe that an opportunity was offered to the board to justify itself before the business community of the whole country in the matter of grain inspection, if such justification is possible; and if not, then to set right whatever may be wrong in the method of grain inspection. That subject calls for some further comment.

It is not a mooted question in morality that adulteration is wrong; that the grocer who sands his sugar, or waters his whiskey, or puts chicory in his coffee, or peach-leaves in his tea, is a cheat. If he is a wholesale grocer, it is not considered a valid defense that he does not deceive the retail grocer who buys of him, because the latter understands that the sugar or the coffee, the whiskey or the sugar, have been so treated, and purchases with that understanding. The articles go finally into the hands of the consumer, who does not buy with any such understanding, or, at least, with any knowledge of what he is either cheated unknowingly into paying for something which he does not wish to buy, or, if he knows that he is cheated, accepts the fact because he cannot help himself. But does so with indignant protest. No matter how many there are who are consenting to the fraud, a fraud there is from which somebody suffers, and that sufferer is generally the consumer. If it were not so there would be no fraud, for frauds are not committed without a motive. There is not, we presume, a single member of the Board of Trade who would not instantly change his grocer if he believed he was in the habit of putting upon him tea, or coffee, or sugar, which was partly those articles and partly something else. Nor would he accept it, even as a palliation of the wrong done him and his family, if it were replied to his remonstrance that this system of fraudulent adulteration was "the custom of the trade;" but would probably reply that "the trade, then, might drink the stuff and be *dashed* to it!"

Now we do not see, and we believe the public does not see, why this principle is not just as applicable to the mixing of grains as to the adulteration of groceries. It is understood that such mixtures are common among our grain dealers, and that it is done in two ways; good grain and that of an inferior quality are mixed together, and passed as good, as in the case of No. 2 wheat and lower grades; or one kind of grain is mixed with another kind to give it weight, and passed as the first kind, as in the case of corn and barley. The certificates of inspection of grain state in one case either that the grain is all of the quality of the best of the mixture; or, if they recognize the fact of mixture as all, where two grains are mixed, they certify only to the quantity and quality of one kind, the best, and indicate the presence of the other kind also on the same vessel, without stating where or of what kind, by the words "mixed cargo." Take two instances by way of illustration: A grain dealer has a quantity of No. 2 spring wheat which he goes to sell or ship for a market. It is of the best quality and worth the highest price. He has also another quantity of another, and perhaps much lower grade, and, of course, worth only a lower price. A certain portion of the latter is mixed with the No. 2, but so carefully mixed as to avoid detection, while it deteriorates the quality. Has not, he asks, a man a right to do as he pleases with his own property? Unquestionably, if he does not work to injury to anybody else. The purchaser, he adds, understands that such mixture has been made, and he, therefore, is guiltless of fraud. But that is not the end of the transaction. The purchaser buys it well aware, as he is, that it is to be sold at last to the miller, and the flour-dealer, and the baker, or the domestic consumer, who buy and use, at the highest price, an adulterated article, which is not worth the price they pay for it. The fraud is, in effect, practiced upon the consumer, and that fraud is made possible by the mixture made for that fraudulent purpose. That it is the custom of the trade is no defense of it. Trade is not to be conducted by trader rules with No. 2 oats an inferior quality, or mixes a quantity of barley with an inferior quality of oats, to give it weight and make it pass as No. 2. Here the fraud is precisely the same on the final consumer who buys the adulterated article as No. 2 oats. Nor does the fraud stop here. The producer, as well as the consumer, is a sufferer. The reputation which, in the course of trade, has become attached to No. 2 wheat and No. 2 oats in the Eastern markets is such that these grades uniformly rule less than similar grades of Milwaukee grains, and the dealer who offers these grades, which are honestly what they purport to be, must either sell at a lower price than his rightful due, or commit a further fraud by rating the grain at a higher grade than belongs to it. Out of all this has grown up a system of fraudulent certificates, of trickery and deception, the exposure of which has undoubtedly been of serious injury to the trade of Chicago, and which has resulted in doubling the end which it was hoped to gain by it. We presume these statements to not be questioned, and we submit whether, if it be true that honesty is the best policy, it is not worth while for the Board of Trade to look the thing squarely in the face, as it undoubtedly has done in the case in Iowa it, that its "was in earnest about it previously, and to establish for any injury committed by either, would seem have to be careful, and, to avoid punishment for crime, would provide himself with competent and properly-educated compounders of medicine. A druggist may very properly receive the highest confidence of his customers, and be appointed to fulfilling only four of the years at the general expense and the other part at the cost of the property saved. This work to be remedied in some form.

THE CITY SEWERS.

The Committee on Municipal Corporations in the House of Representatives, on Saturday, announced that part of the general act relating to cities of the larger class which provides for sewers, by striking out what is known as the "Talcy" bill, and inserting a provision from the "Mayors'" bill. What has been inserted is as follows:

SECTION 1. That whenever it shall become necessary, in the opinion of the City Council, to provide a general system of sewerage and drainage for the City, the City Council shall have power so to do, and for that purpose may cause the whole or any part of the city to be laid off into districts, to be drained by principal sewers, and may provide by ordinance for the general plan or drainage by sewers or drains for the whole city, and for the plan and record the same.

SEC. 2. That the City Council shall have power to levy and collect a special tax for the construction of the sewers, or any part thereof, in any district, and to issue certificates of indebtedness for such special assessment against the property in such district, payable in not more than ten annual instalments, with interest at a rate not exceeding seven per cent per annum, and to provide for the collection of the same by ordinance prescribed, but the notice of the time and place of making the assessment and of the application for a confirmation thereof, shall be given as in the case of assessments for other local improvements by special assessment.

SEC. 3. That the City Council shall have power to change and alter such districts from time to time, by a vote of two-thirds of the members elected.

SEC. 4. Where the city shall not be divided into districts by the said City Council, as above provided, relating to the same, the city shall constitute one district, and the city shall, in constructing sewers and drains, and levying and collecting assessments therefor, be governed as provided in Chapter 4 of this act.

This does not meet the difficulty which at present exists in Chicago; on the contrary, it increases it. What this city needs is some provision by which the present debt, and the interest thereon incurred for building the 145 miles of sewers already constructed, shall be paid. These sewers have been built at a cost of $3,000,000. Of that sum $500,000 have been paid; the remainder, bearing an annual interest of about $180,000, is a charge upon the real property of the city, and the whole city has a general interest in the payment of the debt. There is no serious objection to special assessments for sewers, because that process is a saving of 50 per cent in their cost; but there is a general protest against the injustice of taxing one class of the taxable property of the whole city to pay $3,000,000 of original cost and $3,000,000 of interest for constructing 145 miles of sewers, and then compelling a portion of the real estate of the city to pay for those to be hereafter constructed. Every sewer built is, ipso facto, a benefit to the city, but it has a special benefit to the property it drains. No person builds a house in this city, no matter how remote may be its location, who does not do so expecting to have it improved, benefited, and rendered habitable by direct connection with the sewers, water, and gas. All unimproved property in this city, in front of which the gas, and water pipes, and sewers are constructed, have an additional cash value, and are more salable than if not so improved, and this additional cash value is a benefit, and greater than the cost of laying the pipes or constructing the sewers. Sewers are an essential, particularly in this city. They cannot be dispensed with; and everybody is willing to pay for them. But where a lot has paid its share for this convenience, it ought not to be taxed therefor forever. When a lot has contributed the city its cost for its sewerage, it ought to be relieved from any further tax. Thus, whether the sewerage be carried on generally or by districts, the special assessment plan is the most economical. Under the district system, the plan would work pretty fairly. Take the Fifteenth Ward as a district. Under this rule, the property in that ward would be taxed to raise, say, $75,000 or $100,000 a year, to be expended exclusively in that ward for sewers; and, when the work was completed, the property of the ward would be forever released from the tax for that purpose. Under the general tax system, $600,000 will be raised annually for sewers, of which the Fifteenth Ward will have $25,000, to be expended within its limits for sewerage, and will pay $15,000 of the tax. In this way that ward will be sewered some time near the year 1900, and, in consideration of that fact, the property of that ward for the preceding fifty years will be taxed to pay for building sewers in the twenty additional square miles of territory which will be added to the city in that time. Under the Talcy bill, any ward or section of the city, upon the payment of $1.40 per front foot, can have all the sewers it may want, and be forever after discharged from sewer tax. Whether the district system or the Talcy plan be adopted, is of very little moment, provided there be an adjustment of the present difficulty.

On the city system the property now drained by sewers the cost of constructing them, or reimburse the City Treasury the amount set aside for that purpose? If this can be done then a provision to that effect, making it by our charter, would remove from the mind of every man in this city a load of anxiety. That would make the city to-day worth more than all the property now assessed for sewers, and the property now sewered would be relieved from all further taxation for that purpose. The Cook County delegation at Springfield have this question before them, and ought to be able to adopt some satisfactory arrangement. We do not think there are two sides to the question as to the justice, policy, and advisability of the system of assessing all property for the payment of the expenses of the sewers, and not charging a part of the expense to the general expense and the other part at the cost of the property sewered. This ought to be remedied in some form.

THE CITY SEWERS.

The Committee on Municipal Corporations in the House of Representatives, on Saturday, announced that part of the general act relating to cities of the larger class which provides for sewers, by striking out what is known as the "Talcy" bill, and inserting a provision from the "Mayors'" bill. What has been inserted is as follows:

SECTION 1. That whenever it shall become necessary, in the opinion of the City Council, to provide a general system of sewerage and drainage for the City, the City Council shall have power so to do, and for that purpose may cause the whole or any part of the city to be laid off into districts, to be drained by principal sewers, and may provide by ordinance for the general plan or drainage by sewers or drains for the whole city, and for the plan and record the same.

SEC. 2. That the City Council shall have power to levy and collect a special tax for the construction of the sewers, or any part thereof, in any district, and to issue certificates of indebtedness for such special assessment against the property in such district, payable in not more than ten annual instalments, with interest at a rate not exceeding seven per cent per annum, and to provide for the collection of the same by ordinance prescribed, but the notice of the time and place of making the assessment and of the application for a confirmation thereof, shall be given as in the case of assessments for other local improvements by special assessment.

SEC. 3. That the City Council shall have power to change and alter such districts from time to time, by a vote of two-thirds of the members elected.

SEC. 4. Where the city shall not be divided into districts by the said City Council, as above provided, relating to the same, the city shall constitute one district, and the city shall, in constructing sewers and drains, and levying and collecting assessments therefor, be governed as provided in Chapter 4 of this act.

This does not meet the difficulty which at present exists in Chicago; on the contrary, it increases it. What this city needs is some provision by which the present debt, and the interest thereon incurred for building the 145 miles of sewers already constructed, shall be paid. These sewers have been built at a cost of $3,000,000. Of that sum $500,000 have been paid; the remainder, bearing an annual interest of about $180,000, is a charge upon the real property of the city, and the whole city has a general interest in the payment of the debt. There is no serious objection to special assessments for sewers, because that process is a saving of 50 per cent in their cost; but there is a general protest against the injustice of taxing one class of the taxable property of the whole city to pay $3,000,000 of original cost and $3,000,000 of interest for constructing 145 miles of sewers, and then compelling a portion of the real estate of the city to pay for those to be hereafter constructed. Every sewer built is, ipso facto, a benefit to the city, but it has a special benefit to the property it drains. No person builds a house in this city, no matter how remote may be its location, who does not do so expecting to have it improved, benefited, and rendered habitable by direct connection with the sewers, water, and gas. All unimproved property in this city, in front of which the gas, and water pipes, and sewers are constructed, have an additional cash value, and are more salable than if not so improved, and this additional cash value is a benefit, and greater than the cost of laying the pipes or constructing the sewers. Sewers are an essential, particularly in this city. They cannot be dispensed with; and everybody is willing to pay for them. But where a lot has paid its share for this convenience, it ought not to be taxed therefor forever. When a lot has contributed the city its cost for its sewerage, it ought to be relieved from any further tax. Thus, whether the sewerage be carried on generally or by districts, the special assessment plan is the most economical. Under the district system, the plan would work pretty fairly. Take the Fifteenth Ward as a district. Under this rule, the property in that ward would be taxed to raise, say, $75,000 or $100,000 a year, to be expended exclusively in that ward for sewers; and, when the work was completed, the property of the ward would be forever released from the tax for that purpose. Under the general tax system, $600,000 will be raised annually for sewers, of which the Fifteenth Ward will have $25,000, to be expended within its limits for sewerage, and will pay $15,000 of the tax. In this way that ward will be sewered some time near the year 1900, and, in consideration of that fact, the property of that ward for the preceding fifty years will be taxed to pay for building sewers in the twenty additional square miles of territory which will be added to the city in that time. Under the Talcy bill, any ward or section of the city, upon the payment of $1.40 per front foot, can have all the sewers it may want, and be forever after discharged from sewer tax. Whether the district system or the Talcy plan be adopted, is of very little moment, provided there be an adjustment of the present difficulty.

On the city system the property now drained by sewers the cost of constructing them, or reimburse the City Treasury the amount set aside for that purpose? If this can be done then a provision to that effect, making it by our charter, would remove from the mind of every man in this city a load of anxiety. That would make the city to-day worth more than all the property now assessed for sewers, and the property now sewered would be relieved from all further taxation for that purpose. The Cook County delegation at Springfield have this question before them, and ought to be able to adopt some satisfactory arrangement. We do not think there are two sides to the question as to the justice, policy, and advisability of the system of assessing all property for the payment of the expenses of the sewers, and not charging a part of the expense to the general expense and the other part at the cost of the property sewered. This ought to be remedied in some form.

THE SONGO.

Mr. Forbes's engagement, which has not been a financial success to the manager, is to be terminated this evening. The Songo, the unknown imitator of the banjo-strumming and foot-elevating Lotta. Simultaneously therewith, Chicago will have, at the Opera House, another imitator of Lydia Thompson's burlesque business; at the Museum, a blood-and-thunder Bowery piece, intoxicated with the worst vices of sensationalism; a fair-to-middling gymnast; at the West Side Theatre, a burlesque of imitation of *Joseph Jefferson's* "Rip Van Winkle;" at the minstrel houses, the usual variety troupes; and at the Winter Garden, we don't know what, but something warranted to be worse than any of the others. The manager of one of our theatres has a sense of humor, appreciation and very assiduous endeavors to please the better class of play-goers, by bringing out approved pieces, has lost nearly all the money that he has made in the past, and definitively reduced to the demand for something new and sensational, saying: "They wont patronize what they ought to, and I'll see if I can't give them what they want."

And he is right. There's no use lecturing managers of theatres about what amusements the public ought to patronize. Every one of them would rather be manager of a first-class theatre, with Shakespeare and Sheridan for his playwrights, and a stock company of high-toned actors, than of a variety or a burlesque. But is that a reason why he should? Is it a history which can't be indulged, in this country at least; no our best way is to let the managers cater for us whatever pays well again, and let us, as we do, be the ones to last to the miller, and the flour-dealer, and the baker, or the domestic consumer, who buy and use, at the highest price, an adulterated article, which is not worth the price they pay for it. The fraud is, in effect, practiced upon the consumer, and that fraud is made possible by the mixture made for that fraudulent purpose. That it is the custom of the trade is no defense of it. Trade is not to be conducted by trader rules with No. 2 oats an inferior quality, or mixes a quantity of barley with an inferior quality of oats, to give it weight and make it pass as No. 2. Here the fraud is precisely the same on the final consumer who buys the adulterated article as No. 2 oats. Nor does the fraud stop here. The producer, as well as the consumer, is a sufferer. The reputation which, in the course of trade, has become attached to No. 2 wheat and No. 2 oats in the Eastern markets is such that these grades uniformly rule less than similar grades of Milwaukee grains, and the dealer who offers these grades, which are honestly what they purport to be, must either sell at a lower price than his rightful due, or commit a further fraud by rating the grain at a higher grade than belongs to it. Out of all this has grown up a system of fraudulent certificates, of trickery and deception, the exposure of which has undoubtedly been of serious injury to the trade of Chicago, and which has resulted in doubling the end which it was hoped to gain by it. We presume these statements to not be questioned, and we submit whether, if it be true that honesty is the best policy, it is not worth while for the Board of Trade to look the thing squarely in the face, as it undoubtedly has done in the case in Iowa it, that its "was in earnest about it previously, and to establish for any injury committed by either, would seem have to be careful, and, to avoid punishment for crime, would provide himself with competent and properly-educated compounders of medicine. A druggist may very properly receive the highest confidence of his customers, and be appointed to fulfilling only four of the years at the general expense and the other part at the cost of the property saved. This work to be remedied in some form.

THE SONGO.

Mr. Forbes's engagement, which has not been a financial success to the manager, is to be terminated this

SPRINGFIELD.

Special Dispatch to The Chicago Tribune.

WHO RIDE PASS.

SPRINGFIELD, Ill., March 4.—The Committee on Military Affairs reported back the Rock Island Bridge bill, recommending that only $10,000 a year, instead of $20,000, be raised for the Governor's contingent fund for the ensuing two years, on the ground that only $10,000 a year, during the half-drill day, can be raised for the Governor's contingent fund for the ensuing two years, on the ground that only $10,000 a year is required. The Committee on Public Buildings reported favorably on the bill to appropriate $10,000 for the purchase of a site for the Normal University, and $50,000 for the erection of buildings thereon

"REGENERATION."

The Cheney Trial from a Universalist Standpoint.

Review of the Case by Rev. Dr. Ryder, of St. Paul's Church.

He Predicts New Difficulties and Complications.

In the request of many of the supporters of the Universalist, as well as a number of prominent citizens, Rev. Dr. Ryder, pastor of St. Paul's Universalist Church, on last evening repeated the sermon he preached one week ago, on the subject of the Cheney Trial." Although the weather was unfavorable, the audience room was filled to its utmost capacity, and numerous persons were turned away for want of room. The text was taken from Matthew vii. 1—"Judge not that ye be not judged"—and the sermon as follows:

I suppose what I am to preach to you this morning is the fashionable sensation of the week. Most of the passages which I have just read, Paul, the apostle of the Gentiles, wrote to his own people, and not to the heathen, or to Christians, as such. Yet they have been the basis of the Sermons of Illinois and Universalist clergymen, and of the Christian Church generally, ever since the days of Paul. Indeed, they are the basis of all Christian preaching. Perhaps the world is not more interested in any Christian sermon than it is in the sermons of Universalists. Not if he repeat that word "regeneration" which has been so much in the mouths of the people of late, and which, I suppose, will be more frequently heard in the future than in the past. Regeneration is the doctrine of the Christian Church. It is the doctrine of the Universalist Church. It is the doctrine of the Christian ministry. It is the doctrine of the Christian pulpit. It is the doctrine of the Christian press. It is the doctrine of Christian literature. It is the doctrine of Christian song. It is the doctrine of Christian worship. It is the doctrine of Christian conversation. It is the doctrine of Christian life. It is the doctrine of Christian character. It is the doctrine of Christian hope. It is the doctrine of Christian faith. It is the doctrine of Christian love. It is the doctrine of Christian charity. It is the doctrine of Christian benevolence. It is the doctrine of Christian self-denial. It is the doctrine of Christian self-sacrifice. It is the doctrine of Christian heroism. It is the doctrine of Christian martyrdom. It is the doctrine of Christian missions. It is the doctrine of Christian education. It is the doctrine of Christian reform. It is the doctrine of Christian progress. It is the doctrine of Christian civilization. It is the doctrine of Christian liberty. It is the doctrine of Christian equality. It is the doctrine of Christian fraternity. It is the doctrine of Christian unity. It is the doctrine of Christian peace. It is the doctrine of Christian rest. It is the doctrine of Christian heaven. It is the doctrine of Christian immortality. It is the doctrine of Christian eternity. It is the doctrine of Christian God. It is the doctrine of Christ himself. It is the doctrine of the Bible. It is the doctrine of the universe. It is the doctrine of the ages. It is the doctrine of the world. It is the doctrine of the past. It is the doctrine of the present. It is the doctrine of the future. It is the doctrine of time. It is the doctrine of eternity. It is the doctrine of God. It is the doctrine of man. It is the doctrine of the human race. It is the doctrine of the human soul. It is the doctrine of the human heart. It is the doctrine of the human life. It is the doctrine of the human character. It is the doctrine of the human destiny. It is the doctrine of the human hope. It is the doctrine of the human faith. It is the doctrine of the human love. It is the doctrine of the human charity. It is the doctrine of the human benevolence. It is the doctrine of the human self-denial. It is the doctrine of the human self-sacrifice. It is the doctrine of the human heroism. It is the doctrine of the human martyrdom. It is the doctrine of the human missions. It is the doctrine of the human education. It is the doctrine of the human reform. It is the doctrine of the human progress. It is the doctrine of the human civilization. It is the doctrine of the human liberty. It is the doctrine of the human equality. It is the doctrine of the human fraternity. It is the doctrine of the human unity. It is the doctrine of the human peace. It is the doctrine of the human rest. It is the doctrine of the human heaven. It is the doctrine of the human immortality. It is the doctrine of the human eternity. It is the doctrine of the human God. It is the doctrine of the human Christ. It is the doctrine of the human Bible. It is the doctrine of the human universe. It is the doctrine of the human ages. It is the doctrine of the human world. It is the doctrine of the human past. It is the doctrine of the human present. It is the doctrine of the human future. It is the doctrine of the human time. It is the doctrine of the human eternity. It is the doctrine of the human God. It is the doctrine of the human